

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Restriction Requirement dated November 21, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 21, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1-30 remain pending following entry of this response. Applicants submit that the amendments and new claims do not introduce new matter.

### Election / Restrictions

Claims 1-30 stand restricted under 35 U.S.C. 121 as follows:

- I. Claims 1-6, drawn to an integrated circuit, classified in class 257, subclass 48.
- II. Claims 7-15, drawn to an integrated circuit, classified in class 257, subclass 48.
- III. Claim 29, drawn to an integrated circuit, classified in class 257, subclass 48.
- IV. Claim 30, drawn to an integrated circuit, classified in class 257, subclass 48.
- V. Claims 16-22, drawn to a test system for testing an integrated circuit, classified in class 324, subclass 763.
- VI. Claims 23-28, drawn to a method for testing an integrated circuit, classified in class 324, subclass 763.

Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, the claims of Group I (claims 1-6) for examination. There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions: (A) the inventions must be independent; and (B) there

must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction were not required. (MPEP § 803). Applicants submit that, in the present case, the Examiner has not properly established or satisfied the criteria for a proper requirement for restriction.

Considering first Groups I and II, Applicants submit that there is no serious burden on the Examiner to examine these groups together. First off, the Examiner concedes these belong in the same class and subclass. Secondly, independent claims 1 and 7 differ only in their last elements, which are both switching devices that have similar functions described in different manners. Thus, Applicants submit they may be examined together without serious burden.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner, at a minimum, withdrawal the restriction requirement with respect to Groups I and II and consider these claims without restriction.

Regarding Group V, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 16 is directed to a test system for testing an integrated circuit such as that covered in Groups I and II. In fact, the only additional element with respect to independent claim 7 is an external test device connected to the integrated circuit. Thus, Applicants submit these groups may also be examined together without serious burden.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner also withdraw the restriction requirement with respect to Groups I, II and V and consider these claims without restriction.

## CONCLUSION

Having addressed all issues set out in the Restriction Requirement, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Randol W. Read  
Registration No. 43,876  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicant(s)